

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully solicited.

The transcription at page 12 line 1 of "remaininder" has been changed to --remainder-- . Accordingly, the objection to the specification is now moot.

Claim 1 has been amended in accordance with the specification at page 32 [line 25] - page 33 [line 2]. Claims 7-9, 36-39, 40-43, and 44-47 have been canceled.

Claims 1-6 recite *inter alia* supplying heat for a reforming reaction from a first power generating means.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of Claims 7-9, 36-39, 40-43, and 44-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second [alone and with reference to the sixth paragraph of Section 112]. The rejections under 35 USC § 112 are now moot; claims 7-9, 36-39, 40-43, and 44-47 have been canceled.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims over Xu alone or in view of Morimoto et al. or further in view of Gagnon and/or Scheffler.

In applicants' view, the analysis of the U.S. PTO does not appear to establish the differences between the subject matter claimed and the information in the applied references; this determination is one of the elements of the *Graham v. John Deere* investigation. In applicants' view, if the determination required by *Graham v. John Deere* is undertaken, the claims presented herein are patentable. Specifically, in applicants' view, the allegations that certain element(s) "read(s)" on does not appear to be the analysis dictated by the Graham second inquiry. In applicants' view, the claims are patentable. These comments are augmented in view of the Examiner's June 14 comments.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims over Xu alone or in view of Morimoto et al.

Xu does not teach a second power generating means. Accordingly, Xu does not describe the last two paragraphs of Claim 1. The question of obviousness can not be predicated on unknown information.

Morimoto requires a direct "**first line**" for introducing in the second fuel cell gases discharged from the first anode into a second anode; and a **second line** for introducing in to the second anode gases discharged from the first cathode. Morimoto does not appear to describe the last three paragraphs of Claim 1 under rejection. Accordingly, together the references fail to describe the last two paragraphs of Claim 1; that is, Morimoto fails to make up for the Xu description deficiencies. Accordingly, combination of the two references does not establish a prima facie case of obviousness.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 3, 6, and 9, 20, 21, 32, 33, 44 and 45 under 35 USC 103 over Xu alone in view of Morimoto et al. further in view of Gagnon. As noted above, Xu and Morimoto et al fail alone or in combination to describe at least the last two paragraphs of Claim 1. In applicants' view the Gagnon description at column 3 refers to a "hydrogen condenser 42", but does not make up for the deficiencies of Xu and Morimoto discussed above. In applicant's view, there is nothing in the Gagnon description which requires a second power generating means of Claim 1 under examination.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 12-19, 24-31, 36-43 over Xu alone or in view of Morimoto et al. or further in view of Scheffler. Applicants also respectfully traverse the rejection of Claims 20, 21, 32, 33, 44 and 45 over Xu alone in view of Morimoto et al. and Gagnon further in view of Scheffler.

In applicant's view, there is nothing in the Scheffler description which requires a second power generating means. Thus, Applicant's note the USPTO reliance to allege that it would be obvious to modify Xu with a "powerplant microprocessor control and "air inlet valve" of Scheffler. Xu provides no reason to make such a modification; nor does Scheffler suggest that such a modification of Xu description is appropriate. For reasons set forth above, the Xu reference deficiencies, also dictate that combination of the Gagnon reference would not result in the subject matter of Claim 1.

Per the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment of March , the amendment to specification has been edited to include line 25 et seq of Page 11.

Reconsideration and an early allowance are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 16, 2007 (Monday)



Marina V. Schneller
Registration No. 26032
VENABLE LLP
P.O. Box 34385
Washington, D.C. 20043-9998
Telephone: (202) 344-4000
Telefax: (202) 344-8300

DC2DOCS1/876580